DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 122 UD 029 200

AUTHOR Quimper, Barry E.; Claus, Richard N.
TITLE Compensatory Education Process Evaluation: Elementary and Secondary Academic Achievement (A2). 1992-93.
INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Mar 93
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Ancillary School Services; *Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Formative Evaluation; Intervention; *Mathematics Instruction; Principals; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Reading Instruction; School Social Workers; Supplementary Education; Thinking Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Saginaw City School System MI; Service Delivery Assessment

ABSTRACT

An evaluative study was done of the supplemental education delivery system in reading and mathematics in the School District of the City of Saginaw (Michigan) at 28 schools. At the elementary school level the system includes push-in and pull-out programs in reading and mathematics and in reading intervention that served 2,494 students in grades one through six. At the secondary school level the system offers a self-contained classroom program for 838 students in grades 7 through 12 and a Thinking Skills Program for grades seven through nine. The program was assessed using a process evaluation involving monitoring throughout the year to determine if the program was being implemented as planned. The evaluation focused on supportive services using a questionnaire to gather information from 12 principals and assigned school social workers. Results found that successes included the following: (1) 41.2 percent believed the communication process for the program had improved; (2) the three most frequently mentioned activities/services of Project Success were after-school study centers (82.3 percent), mentoring programs (35.3 percent), and adopt-a-school (23.5 percent); and (3) 35.2 percent of principals rated their services either excellent or good. Appendixes contain the evaluation questionnaire, statistical information, program descriptions, and tabulated results of the questionnaire. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED357122

# EVALUATION REPORT

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ($A^2$)

1992-93

## DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SAGINAW

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. N. Claus

School District C. of Saginaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**Saginaw, Michigan**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

# ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ($A^2$)

## 1992-93

An Approved Report of the

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION, TESTING AND RESEARCH


Richard N. Claus, Ph.D.
Manager, Program Evaluation

Barry E. Quimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing & Research


Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent
School District of the City of Saginaw

March, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| PROGRAM DESCRIPTION | 1 |
| PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES | 4 |
| PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA | 5 |
| Pupil Service Team | 5 |
| Project Success | 7 |
| Recommendations to Improve PST and Project Success | 7 |
| APPENDICES | 8 |
| Appendix A: Checklist For Middle School Principals | 9 |
| Appendix B: 1992-93 Count of Program Participants for Total Chapter 1, Total Article 3, and Total Compensatory Education | 11 |
| Appendix C: Description of the Six Components of the Compensatory Education Program | 20 |
| Appendix D: Memo and Tabulated Results of Principals Pupil Service Team (PST) Process Evaluation Questionnaire | 26 |

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School District of the City of Saginaw operates a supplemental education delivery system in reading and mathematics consisting of two programs — elementary and secondary Compensatory Education (CE). The elementary CE is both a push-in program (that operates in the regular classroom in grades one and two) and a pull-out program (periodically taking students out of regular classrooms) that serves 2,494 students in grades one through six. The Reading Recovery program (a pull-out intervention in reading in grade one serving or having served approximately 100 pupils) is in its second pilot year. The secondary CE is a self-contained classroom program which involved approximately 838 students in grades seven through twelve. In its third year was the Thinking Skills Programs (TSP) that operated in grades 7-9 in a self-contained room setting.[1] The CE programs are funded by both the Federal Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter 1 and Article 3 of the State School Aid Act.

Summarized in the chart below are demographic characteristics that describe both the elementary and secondary levels of CE in greater detail.

---

[1]The Thinking Skills Program (TSP) is the local name for the nationally validated Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) program. See Appendix A for a checklist for middle school principals interested in HOTS for a further in-depth operational description.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION (CE) PROGRAMS

| Program | Grade Levels Served | Approximate Number of Students Served* | Number of Full-Time Equivalent Teachers | Number of Full-Time Classroom Aides | Number of School Sites | Program Setting | Instructional Services |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Achievement, Elementary | 1-6 | 2,494 | 38.0 | 3.0 | 23 | Push-in (grades 1 & 2) in math) and Pull-out (grades 2-6 in math and grades 1-6 in reading.)** | - Reading<br>- Mathematics |
| Academic Achievement, Secondary | 7-12 | 838 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 5 | Self-Contained Classroom | - Reading***<br>- Mathematics*** |

*Detailed counts by funding source, building, and grade can be found in Appendix B.

**The Reading Recovery Program (pilot) operated as a pull-out program in grade one.

***The Thinking Skills Program (TSP) operated in grades 7-9 in place of a reading and/or mathematics program.

As can be seen from the chart above, the primary purpose of the programs is to improve the reading and mathematics achievement of a designated number of educationally disadvantaged children. The children in the program are screened for entry with the California Achievement Tests--Form E/F (CAT). Students were determined eligible for the CE programs if they scored at or below the 36th normal curve equivalent (NCE) on the reading and/or mathematics computation subtests of the CAT (this is equivalent to a score at or below the 25th percentile). This year approximately 3,332 pupils are participating in the compensatory education programs.

This year there were six other program components in addition to the basic CE programs that were added to the overall program. These components included the following: Home-School Aides; Staff Development; Pupil Service Team; Elementary After-School/Extended Day Program; Secondary After-School Tutoring grades 7-9 and 12; and Project Success. A description of each of these six components can be found in Appendix C.

The broad goals of these basic CE programs were to: 1) provide intensive academic instruction to the educationally disadvantaged, 2) involve parents in the program, 3) supply students with incentives for academic achievement, 4) operate staff inservice programs, 5) measure academic growth, and 6) prepare students to effectively meet the academic competition of the general classroom. These goals are the focus of the Compensatory Education Department's activities throughout the 1992-93 school year.

## PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A process evaluation involves monitoring a program throughout the year to determine if the program is being implemented as planned. This makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that influence a program's outcome.

This year's process evaluation efforts, again as last year's, focused on supportive services provided by the pupil service team (consisting of counselors, social worker, psychologist and building staff) and Project Success (special assistance program for students who have not shown positive academic growth for the past two years). A questionnaire was used to gather information about the operation of the pupil service team (PST) and Project Success (see Appendix D for a copy). All building principals (with one or more compensatory education students who have not shown substantial positive academic growth for the two past years in compensatory education) were mailed the questionnaire on January 18, 1993. The building principal along with the assigned school social worker were to jointly complete the questionnaire concerning the operation of the building's PST and its interaction with Project Success staff members. The completed questionnaires were to be returned via interoffice mail by January 29, 1993.

## PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA

The 1992-93 Chapter 1/Article 3 Pupil Service Team (PST) Process Evaluation Questionnaire was sent out to the 17 building principals on January 18, 1993. As of February 12, 1993 when the results were tabulated, 5 of 5 (100.0%) of the secondary and 12 of 12 (100.0%) of the elementary principals had returned the questionnaire. The detailed tabulated results are presented in Appendix D.

What follows are the salient points stemming from this year's process evaluation efforts into the operation of the Pupil Service Team (PST) and Project Success. These service groups were to develop a program of remedial services for each of a select group of compensatory education pupils (students who did not show substantial progress in the program for the last two consecutive years). The major points relative to PST operations and the Project Success operations will be shared. Finally the primary points relating to improving the operations of PST/Project Success in the future will be presented.

### Pupil Service Team

- A majority 13 of 17 (76.5%) of the PST's first meetings were between August 30, 1992 and September 26, 1992 with the remaining 4 of 17 (23.5%) taking place from September 27, 1992 until some time into October, 1992.
- The modal number of PST meetings held as of January 15, 1993 was eight with the actual range from 4 to 11 meetings during this time perid.
- The length of a typical PST meeting was 50 minutes (median) with the actual range from 30 to 120 minutes.
- A majority of building's PST meetings 10 of 17 or 58.8% are scheduled on a biweekly basis with the remainder scheduled weekly 11.8%, monthly 11.8%, weekly/biweekly 11.8%, and biweekly/monthly 5.9%.

- The three most frequent regular members of the PST included the following: building administrator (100.0%), social worker (100.0%), and school psychologist (82.3%).

- The three most frequent occasional members of the PST included the following: compensatory education teacher (73.3%), classroom teacher (53.3%), and outreach worker (46.7%).

- All 17 buildings PST meetings are chaired by a social worker and of these 12 (70.6%) of the social workers are either the primary person to maintain minutes or have shared responsibilities to maintain the minutes.

- From the number of completed student improvement plans, it appears most, if not all, of the "two or more year students" from compensatory education have a completed student improvement plan.

- Approximately a third (35.7%) of the buildings feel that providing parent notification and seeking parent permission forms slows down the process of providing services to selected compensatory education students.

- Almost half (47.0%) of the buildings have had other problems in completing the student improvement plans.

- Approximately 15 students on the "two or more year" list still needs a written student improvement plan. Of these only one may require further evaluations.

- The number one student need addressed on student improvement plans is <u>academic</u> followed in order by social behavior, attendance and emotional were tied, family, and health.

- The median number of review meetings held to date was two.

- Almost all respondents to the survey (16 of 17 or 94.1%) had attended the inservice session concerning PST/Project Success held this fall.

- Of the 16 buildings attending the inservice, 7 of 16 (43.8%) rated its overall effectiveness to improve practices in the PST process as good to excellent.

- Approximately half (47.1%) felt the PST forms improved since last year.

## Project Success

- A little less than half (41.2%) believe the communication process concerning PST and Project Success has improved.
- The three most frequently mentioned activities/services of Project Success were the following: after-school study center (82.3%), mentoring program (35.3%), and adopt-a-school (23.5%).
- Considering the work done so far this year by Project Success staff to provide services, 6 of the 17 (35.2%) building principals rated their services either excellent or good.

## Recommendations to Improve PST and Project Success

The following were some of the most frequently mentioned recommendations offered by staff. The complete set of recommendations by appropriate question can be found in Appendix D.

- More time should be made available to meet with concerned staff so a comprehensive/complete plan can be developed.
- A reduction in paper work (or more time to complete this paper work) should be instituted so that the PST process could move along more quickly.
- Employ Project Success people during the summer to obtain signatures of parents so the process would not be slowed down at the start of school.
- Add more social workers so that the PST process could move more quickly forward.
- Redesign home evaluation forms to obtain essential information to speed process along. Also simplify forms and data required wherever possible.
- Provide buildings with the list of compensatory education students earlier.
- Require parents to meet with the social worker as part of enrollment process to sign notification forms and complete student histories.
- All PST forms need to be assembled into one packet just like the special education forms.
- Include Project Success on forms as a referral option.
- More team work needs to be developed between the social worker and the outreach workers.

# APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

# CHECKLIST FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

(Conditions Under Which the HOTS Program is Effective for Chapter 1 and LD Students)

HOTS is a general thinking skills program designed primarily for Chapter 1 and mildly impaired Learning Disabled students in Grades 5-8. The thinking skills are designed to also enhance social interaction and basic skills. HOTS students are currently out-performing national averages for basic skill gains in reading and math, and the program has been validated by the National Diffusion Network.

HOTS represents a new approach to compensatory education. Instead of reteaching the information the students did not previously learn, HOTS provides the types of thinking skills that students need to be able to learn content the first time it is taught in the classroom. Producing basic skill gains, however, requires implementing the program in accordance with the recommendations that follow.

1. HOTS requires a very good teacher. A weak teacher simply cannot be successful. The pedagogical techniques are very sophisticated. The ideal teacher is someone who is very bright, energetic, flexible yet organized, and who above all loves to get kids to talk.

2. HOTS requires a good overall school improvement effort in the regular classroom. HOTS is designed to help a good, or improving, school get better. HOTS should not be implemented in a school with a weak staff, or where extensive school improvement has not already taken place. Since HOTS does not teach content, if the needed content is not covered in the regular classes, basic skills scores will not go up. This means high time-on-task, and quality direct instruction each day in reading and math activities aligned with test objectives.

3. Proper scheduling. The HOTS program is designed to substitute for, and replace, the remedial activities in the school. It needs a minimum of 35 minutes of instruction a day, 4 days a week, on an ongoing basis for 1½—2 years. This can be done either as a pullout or as a separate course. Schools that want to raise math scores can optionally use the fifth day, or 10-15 minutes at the end of each period, for computerized math drill and practice.

   Students should ideally be kept in the program for 1½—2 years, even if they test out at the end of the first year. This extra service is legal and helps students automate their new problem solving skills. First and second year HOTS students should be in separate sections.

   Students should be put into HOTS at the lowest grade level in the school (or when they first arrive). HOTS can be implemented either with a limited number of students, or as a school-wide model serving all needy students at the lowest grade level.

   A teacher can handle up to about 10 students at a time with 9 Apple II computers. A teacher and aide can handle up to about 16 students at a time with 13-15 computers.* Other pupil-teacher ratios with various combinations of personnel can be considered. HOTS project staff will assist in identifying other possible combinations.

   * (It's possible to do the program in the first year with a few less computers, but only for a year.)

4. Quality, classroom instruction available to HOTS students. It is critical that HOTS students get good content instruction in reading and math in their regular classes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. **Proper budgeting.** Costs include: a) purchasing the needed equipment from local vendors, and b) training and support costs. The training and support costs per school are as follows:

| Number of students served | Up to 25 | 25-85 | More than 85 |
|---|---|---|---|
| First year * | $750 | $900 | $1100 |
| Second year | 300 | 400 | 600 |
| Thereafter | 50 | 50 | 100 |

* Includes the support fee for the school and training one HOTS teacher and aide. Each additional HOTS teacher adds $450 to the first year costs. (No added cost the second year).

The support fee includes the curriculum, phone support, the HOTSTUFF newsletter, videotapes, and updates for as long as you use the program.

6. **General support by the principal.** There are a number of general leadership activities that increase the effectiveness of the program. The most important leadership activity is to implement and monitor a good overall school effectiveness program. It is also important to support the HOTS teacher who will have to work very hard, particularly the first year when the curriculum and techniques are unfamiliar. Additional support needs include:

   a) HOTS linkage activities consist of HOTS students writing eight questions and answers around a block of content every three weeks. These questions and answers are then brought to the HOTS lab and entered into the computer to make games and quizzes based on the content. Content teachers interested in working with the students on their writing of the questions in their class should be identified and encouraged to work with the HOTS students.

   b) Schedule presentations about HOTS for the entire staff early in the school year. This includes a 15 minute video overview of the program, and a 1½—2 hour workshop to train content area teachers on how to help students write questions. The latter should be conducted within the first three months by the HOTS teacher.

   c) Support public display of the HOTS students' prowess.

7. **Evaluating HOTS instruction.** DO NOT USE EEI EVALUATION TECHNIQUES. HOTS lessons are different. The best measure of the HOTS teacher's effectiveness is the number of complete answers he/she obtains from students—as opposed to one word answers—without giving obvious hints. The more one-word answers or hints, the weaker the lesson. There should be little talk by the teacher, and a lot by the students.

   DO NOT WORRY IF EARLY IN A UNIT STUDENTS SEEM CONFUSED ABOUT HOW TO PROCEED. Learning to use textual information to deal with uncertainty is one of the key skills that HOTS develops. The students will be successful by the end of the unit.

Feel free to contact Dr. Stanley Pogrow if you have further questions. Dr. Pogrow can be reached at: University of Arizona, College of Education, Tucson AZ 85721 or at (602) 621-1305.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Chapter 1

| Building | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. Baillie | 0 | 32 | 22 | 12 | 35 | 36 | 25 | 162 |
| Coulter | 0 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 74 |
| Emerson | 0 | 23 | 18 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 18 | 151 |
| Fuerbringer | 0 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 77 |
| N. Haley | 0 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 33 | 24 | 112 |
| Handley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heavenrich | 0 | 25 | 18 | 26 | 19 | 33 | 27 | 148 |
| Herig | 0 | 17 | 16 | 30 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 102 |
| Houghton | 0 | 10 | 20 | 17 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 74 |
| Jerome | 0 | 12 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 85 |
| Jones | 0 | 9 | 20 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 82 |
| Kempton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Longfellow | 0 | 19 | 40 | 53 | 27 | 20 | 25 | 184 |
| Longstreet | 0 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 86 |
| J. Loomis | 0 | 42 | 32 | 33 | 37 | 20 | 14 | 178 |
| M. Park | 0 | 25 | 28 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 130 |
| C. Miller | 0 | 27 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 14 | 77 |
| J. Moore | 0 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 93 |
| Morley | 0 | 31 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 102 |
| J. Rouse | 0 | 11 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 11 | 25 | 102 |
| Salina | 0 | 32 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 96 |
| Stone | 0 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 15 | 124 |
| Webber Elem. | 0 | 28 | 40 | 27 | 34 | 25 | 26 | 180 |
| Zilwaukee | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 37 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 451 | 425 | 465 | 375 | 390 | 350 | 2,456 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Chapter 1

| Building | 7 | 8 | 9 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Junior | 96 | 87 | 41 | 224 |
| North Intermediate | 21 | 16 | 66 | 103 |
| South Intermediate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Webber Junior | 65 | 95 | 96 | 256 |
| TOTAL | 184 | 198 | 203 | 585 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Chapter 1

| Building | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arthur Hill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Saginaw High | 19 | 65 | 24 | 108 |
| TOTAL | 19 | 65 | 24 | 108 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

## APPENDIX B

## 1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

**PROGRAM: Total Article 3**

| Building | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. Baillie | 0 | 32 | 0 | 12 | 35 | 36 | 25 | 140 |
| Coulter | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 42 |
| Emerson | 0 | 0 | 18 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Fuerbringer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 46 |
| N. Haley | 0 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Handley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heavenrich | 0 | 25 | 0 | 26 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Herig | 0 | 0 | 16 | 30 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 85 |
| Houghton | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Jerome | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 73 |
| Jones | 0 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Kempton | 0 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 38 |
| Longfellow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 98 |
| Longstreet | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 34 |
| J. Loomis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 20 | 14 | 67 |
| M. Park | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 63 |
| C. Miller | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 47 |
| J. Moore | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 44 |
| Morley | 0 | 31 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 90 |
| J. Rouse | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 41 |
| Salina | 0 | 32 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 31 |
| Stone | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 24 | 0 | 66 |
| Webber Elem. | 0 | 0 | 40 | 27 | 34 | 0 | 26 | 127 |
| Zilwaukee | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 179 | 285 | 306 | 265 | 231 | 175 | 1,441 |

*Count of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Article 3

| Building | 7 | 8 | 9 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Junior | 0 | 87 | 41 | 128 |
| North Intermediate | 21 | 16 | 66 | 103 |
| South Intermediate | 66 | 36 | 45 | 147 |
| Webber Junior | 0 | 95 | 96 | 191 |
| TOTAL | 87 | 234 | 248 | 569 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Article 3

| Building | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arthur Hill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Saginaw High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Compensatory Education

| Building | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. Baillie | 0 | 32 | 22 | 12 | 35 | 36 | 25 | 162 |
| Coulter | 0 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 74 |
| Emerson | 0 | 23 | 18 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 18 | 151 |
| Fuerbringer | 0 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 77 |
| N. Haley | 0 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 33 | 24 | 112 |
| Handley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heavenrich | 0 | 25 | 18 | 26 | 19 | 33 | 27 | 148 |
| Herig | 0 | 17 | 16 | 30 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 102 |
| Houghton | 0 | 10 | 20 | 17 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 74 |
| Jerome | 0 | 12 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 85 |
| Jones | 0 | 9 | 20 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 82 |
| Kempton | 0 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 38 |
| Longfellow | 0 | 19 | 40 | 53 | 27 | 20 | 25 | 184 |
| Longstreet | 0 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 86 |
| J. Loomis | 0 | 42 | 32 | 33 | 37 | 20 | 14 | 178 |
| M. Park | 0 | 25 | 28 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 130 |
| C. Miller | 0 | 27 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 14 | 77 |
| J. Moore | 0 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 93 |
| Morley | 0 | 31 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 102 |
| J. Rouse | 0 | 11 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 11 | 25 | 102 |
| Salina | 0 | 32 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 96 |
| Stone | 0 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 15 | 124 |
| Webber Elem. | 0 | 28 | 40 | 27 | 34 | 25 | 26 | 180 |
| Zilwaukee | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 37 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 463 | 431 | 473 | 382 | 390 | 355 | 2,494 |

*Count of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

APPENDIX B

1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

PROGRAM: Total Compensatory Education

| Building | 7 | 8 | 9 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Junior | 96 | 87 | 41 | 224 |
| North Intermediate | 21 | 16 | 66 | 103 |
| South Intermediate | 66 | 36 | 45 | 147 |
| Webber Junior | 65 | 95 | 96 | 256 |
| TOTAL | 248 | 234 | 248 | 730 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

## APPENDIX B

## 1992-93 COUNT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

**PROGRAM:** Total Compensatory Education

| Building | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arthur Hill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Saginaw High | 19 | 65 | 24 | 108 |
| TOTAL | 19 | 65 | 24 | 108 |

*Count as of December 10, 1992 computer run that included all participants.

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- [ ] [redacted]
- [ ] ELEMENTARY READING
- [ ] ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- [ ] SECONDARY READING
- [ ] SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- [X] OTHER (Specify) Home-School Aides

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS

SCHOOLS SERVED: See list of eligible buildings on Page 2. Item A3.

GRADE LEVELS SERVED: 1-12

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- [ ] Outside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Inside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Replacement Class
- [X] Other (describe) Home-School Aides

Chapter 1 Home-School Aides will assist the building principal and Chapter 1 staff in the accounting and monitoring of Chapter 1 students' attendance and academic progress. Activities will include: regularly scheduled home contacts, observation and notation of problems occurring in the home, assisting in the planning and organization of parent-teacher meetings, maintenance of attendance records for Chapter 1 students, and assisting the Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers with mathematics and reading activities for Chapter 1 students.

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED

5. COORDINATION PLAN

The Chapter 1 Home-School Aides will work with both Chapter 1 and regular teachers to provide information and assistance in working with Chapter 1 students and parents. Key factors in academic success such as attendance and problems occurring in the home will be monitored and this information will be shared with the building staff.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

_____ Teachers

26 Paraprofessionals Home-School Aides

_____ Other (describe) _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- [ ] [illegible]
- [ ] ELEMENTARY READING
- [ ] ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- [ ] SECONDARY READING
- [ ] SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- [X] OTHER (Specify) Staff Development

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS
SCHOOLS SERVED: See list of eligible buildings on Page 3, Item A3.

GRADE LEVELS SERVED: 1-12

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- [ ] Outside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Inside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Replacement Class
- [ ] Other (describe) _____

In mathematics, various inservice sessions at grades 1-6 will be conducted focusing on math manipulatives. In addition, some elementary teachers will be trained in the Reading Recovery method. Chapter 1 teachers in grades 7-9 will receive information and strategies related to the Thinking Skills Program.

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED

5. COORDINATION PLAN

In mathematics, Chapter 1 teachers and classroom teachers will instruct students together in the classroom at grades 1-6 on a voluntary basis. As a result of the training received, Chapter 1 and classroom teachers will instruct students using the same information, strategies and materials.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

_____ Teachers

_____ Paraprofessionals

.8 Other (describe) Reading Recovery Teacher Trainer



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- ☐ [illegible]
- ☐ ELEMENTARY READING
- ☐ ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- ☐ SECONDARY READING
- ☐ SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- ☒ OTHER (Specify) Pupil Service Team

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS

SCHOOLS SERVED: See list of eligible buildings on Page 2, Item A3.

GRADE LEVELS SERVED: PreK-12

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- ☐ Outside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Inside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Replacement Class
- ☒ Other (describe) _____

Pupil Service Teams (consisting of counselors, social workers, and psychologists) will be established to provide Chapter 1 student assistance with academic, attendance, socio-emotional, and health problems. Services will include screening, diagnosis, evaluation, and intervention as necessary. In addition, the Pupil Service Teams will assist the families of students who have exhibited identified problems and will make referrals to appropriate agencies within the community.

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED

5. COORDINATION PLAN

The Pupil Service Teams will provide information and training to parents, teachers, and principals on the purpose and services available from the teams. The Pupil Service Teams will coordinate their efforts with the Chapter 1 and regular education teachers to plan and implement alternative instructional methods, techniques, or adjustments which could be made in the classroom. Assistance will also be provided in dealing with socio-emotional and behavioral problems.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

_____ Teachers

_____ Paraprofessionals

7.5 Other (describe) (3.0 FTE Counselors, 2.5 FTE Social Workers, 2.0 FTE Psych[illegible]ists)



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- [ ] [illegible]
- [ ] ELEMENTARY READING
- [ ] ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- [ ] SECONDARY READING
- [ ] SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- [X] OTHER (Specify) Elementary After School/ Extended Day Program

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS

SCHOOLS SERVED: See list of eligible buildings on Page 3, Item A3 — Program is voluntary

GRADE LEVELS SERVED: i-6

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- [ ] Outside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Inside Regular Classroom
- [ ] Replacement Class
- [X] Other (describe) After School/Extend Day Program

The After School/Extended Day Program serves students who participate in the Chapter 1 Program during the regular school day. The program provides for additional instruction in reading and/or mathematics. Entry into the program is based on need. Class sizes range from 5 to 10 and operates for one hour after school, two to four days per week. The program focuses in on different approaches, use of computers, newspapers, narrative and expository materials, and manipulatives. Learning approaches and materials will focus on the development of both basic skills (e.g., vocabulary development, computation) and more advanced skills (e.g., comprehension, concepts and applications).

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED 2 to 4 hours

5. COORDINATION PLAN

After School/Extended Day teachers will reinforce, extend, and support classroom lessons in reading and mathematics and district-wide objectives in reading and mathematics at each grade level.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

80 Teachers

Participating teachers are paid on an hourly rate.

_____ Paraprofessionals

_____ Other (describe) _____



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- ☐ [illegible]
- ☐ ELEMENTARY READING
- ☐ ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- ☐ SECONDARY READING
- ☐ SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- ☒ OTHER (Specify) Secondary After School Tutoring Grades 7 through 9

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS

| SCHOOLS SERVED: | GRADE LEVELS SERVED: |
|---|---|
| Central Jr, North Intermediate, Webber Jr. | 7-9 |

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- ☐ Outside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Inside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Replacement Class
- ☒ Other (describe) _____

The Secondary After School Tutoring Program serves students who participate in the Chapter 1 Program during the regular school day. The program provides for additional instruction in reading and/or mathematics. Class sizes range from 5 to 10 students per teacher and operate for one hour after school, for four days per week. Learning approaches and materials will focus on the development of both basic skills (e.g., vocabulary development, computation) and more advanced skills (e.g., comprehension, concepts and applications).

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED: 1 to 4 hours

5. COORDINATION PLAN

The Secondary After School Tutoring Program will reinforce, extend, and support classroom lessons and district-wide objectives in reading and mathematics at each grade level.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

Participating teachers are paid on an hourly rate.

- 6 Teachers
- _____ Paraprofessionals
- _____ Other (describe) _____



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Check only ONE)

- ☐ [illegible]
- ☐ SECONDARY READING
- ☐ ELEMENTARY READING
- ☐ SECONDARY MATHEMATICS
- ☐ ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS
- ☒ OTHER (Specify) Project Success

2. PROGRAM LOCATIONS
SCHOOLS SERVED: See list of eligible buildings on Page 2, Item A3.

GRADE LEVELS SERVED: 1-12

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM SERVICES

- ☐ Outside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Inside Regular Classroom
- ☐ Replacement Class
- ☒ Other (describe) Project Success

Project Success will focus in on those students who have not made any academic gains in the past two years and for whom a special plan for assistance must be developed. Activities will include: establishment of study centers in churches and community centers, recruitment of business and industry for mentors and an Adopt-A-School Program, recruitment of other volunteers to assist with the program, providing information and training to parents, and making referrals to other agencies in the community.

4. AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SERVED

5. COORDINATION PLAN

Project Success staff will work with Chapter 1, regular education teachers and Pupil Service Team to identify, assess, and develop plans for student program improvement for students who have not gained in performance for the past two years.

6. FTE CHAPTER 1 STAFF EMPLOYED IN THIS COMPONENT

- _____ Teachers
- _____ Paraprofessionals
- 5 Other (describe) 1.0 FTE Project Success Specialist and 4.0 FTE Outreach Workers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SAGINAW

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION, TESTING AND RESEARCH

TO: Building Principals

FROM: Richard N. Claus RNC

RE: 1992-93 Chapter 1/Article 3 Pupil Service Team (PST) Process Evaluation Questionnaire.

DATE: January 18, 1993

As a part of the Compensatory Education Process Evaluation, each building is being sent the attached questionnaire relative to PST activities and Project Success services. The Evaluation Department is seeking your responses to the questions as building principal in concert with your assigned social worker and member of the PST. The responses will be tabulated by the Evaluation Department and will be held in confidence.

Please return the completed questionnaire to me no later than January 29, 1993. If there is a problem with this timeline or any question related to this survey, please do not hesitate to contact me at extension 307.

RNC/gal

Attachment

## APPENDIX D

### 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (N=17)

**DIRECTIONS:** This questionnaire is intended to be completed by each building's principal in cooperation with your assigned social worker. Please answer each question as it pertains to the actual operation of the PST at this building during the 1992-93 school year.

1. When was the first meeting of the PST held this school year?

| Dates | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| August 30 - Sept. 5, 1992 | 1 | 5.9 |
| Sept. 6 - Sept. 12, 1992 | 2 | 11.8 |
| Sept. 13 - Sept. 19, 1992 | 8 | 47.0 |
| Sept. 20 - Sept. 26, 1992 | 2 | 11.8 |
| Sept. 27 - Oct. 3, 1992 | 3 | 17.6 |
| Sometime in October, 1992 | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

2. As of January 15, 1993, how many PST meetings have been held this school year?

| Number | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 6 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 7 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 8 | 5 | 29.4 |
| 10 | 3 | 17.6 |
| 11 | 2 | 11.8 |
| Total | 17 | 100.0 |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

3. What is the approximate length in minutes of a typical PST meeting?

| Minutes | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 30 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 40 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 45 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 50 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 67.5 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 75 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 90 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 120 | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.1* |

*Due to rounding.

4. Which of the following, if any, best describes the frequency of your PST meetings this school year? (Check one)

| Frequency | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Weekly | 2 | 11.8 |
| Biweekly | 10 | 58.8 |
| Monthly | 2 | 11.8 |
| Weekly/Biweekly | 2 | 11.8 |
| Biweekly/Monthly | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.1* |

*Due to rounding.

5. Has your PST established a meeting calendar or schedule? (Check one)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| No | 1 | 5.9 |
| Yes | 16 | 94.1 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

## APPENDIX D

### 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

6. Who are the regular members of the PST? Please include each members name and their role/position.

| Role/Position | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Building Administrator | 17 | 100.0 |
| Second and Third Building Administrators | 1 | 5.9 |
| Administrative Intern | 1 | 5.9 |
| Social Worker | 17 | 100.0 |
| School Psychologist | 14 | 82.3 |
| First Counselor | 5 | 29.4 |
| Second Counselor | 5 | 29.4 |
| Third Counselor | 1 | 5.9 |
| Classroom Teacher | 3 | 17.6 |
| Compensatory Education Teacher | 2 | 11.8 |
| Special Education Coordinator | 1 | 5.9 |
| Speech Teacher | 1 | 5.9 |
| Project Success Worker | 1 | 5.9 |
| Resource Officer | 1 | 5.9 |
| Home/School Aide | 1 | 5.9 |

7. Are there staff members who are occasionally part of this building's PST? (Check one)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| No | 2 | 11.8 |
| Yes | 15 | 88.2 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

... If yes, please list their names and roles/positions.

| Role/Position | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Compensatory Education Teacher | 11 | 73.3 |
| Classroom Teacher | 8 | 53.3 |
| Outreach Worker | 7 | 46.7 |
| Speech Pathologist | 5 | 33.3 |
| Home/School Aide | 3 | 20.0 |
| Parent | 3 | 20.0 |
| Bilingual Teacher | 1 | 6.7 |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

8. Who is the chairperson of your PST?

| Role/Position | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Social Worker | 17 | 100.0 |

9. Are minutes maintained for each PST meeting?

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| No | 1 | 5.9 |
| Yes | 16 | 94.1 |

... If minutes are maintained, who takes and maintains these minutes?

| Role/Position | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Social Worker | 11 | 68.8 |
| Split Responsiblity of Social Worker & Speech Teacher | 1 | 5.9 |
| Compensatory Education Teacher | 1 | 5.9 |
| Librarian | 1 | 5.9 |
| Counselor | 1 | 5.9 |
| Psychologist | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 16 | 99.8* |

*Due to rounding.

## APPENDIX D

### 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

10. Completing written student improvement plans for compensatory education students is one function of the PST. To date, how many plans for compensatory education students have been written?

| Number | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 1 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 2 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 3 | 3 | 17.6 |
| 4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 7 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 8 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 9 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 12 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 22 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 35-40 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 42 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 44 | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.2* |

*Due to rounding.

11. Of this number, how many are from your "two or more year students" listing of compensatory education students who demonstrated a gain of two NCE units or less on one or more of the four California Achievement Tests (CAT) subtests?

| Number | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Not Applicable | 1 | 5.9 |
| 1 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 2 | 3 | 17.6 |
| 3 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 4 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 7 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 8 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 11 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 35-40 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 42 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 44 | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.1* |

*Due to rounding.

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

12. Does contacting the parent and having them complete the parent notification and parent permission forms slow you down in providing services to the "two or more year compensatory education students?"

| | # | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No | 11 | 64.7 | |
| Yes | 6 | 35.3 | ... If yes, what can be done to accelerate the process so students can start receiving services of Project Success sooner? |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 | |

- Add more social workers (2)
- Have 12 month Project Success people obtain signatures during the summer (2)
- Provide buildings with the list of students in late August or early September (1)
- Require parent to meet with the social worker as part of enrollment process to sign notification form and complete student history (1)
- Allow us to start before parent permission

13. Have there been other problems in completing written student improvement plans for two or more year compensatory education students?

| | # | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not Applicable | 1 | 5.9 | |
| No | 13 | 47.0 | |
| Yes | 13 | 47.0 | ... If yes, please list these problems briefly from those occurring most often to those occurring infrequently. |
| TOTAL | 17 | 99.9 | |

- Caseload too high (2)
- Single parent or two working parents (2)
- No telephones (2)
- Home evaluation form takes a lot of time (2)
- Too time consuming (1)
- Some confusion about who fills out what (1)
- Hard to get everything back together to fill-in (1)
- Some parents refuse service for their kids (1)
- Scheduling everyone needed for the meetings (1)

## APPENDIX D

### 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

14. Michigan Department of Education staff have informed our district that we are too slow with out Compensatory Education Program in completing the Student Improvement Plans. How could we accelerate the process to get two or more year compensatory education students into Project Success services earlier?

- Too much responsibility on social worker (3)
- Simplify forms and data required (2)
- Get parent signatures earlier (2)
- Better the ratio between the students and the workers/ staff (2)
- Provide the list of students to the buildings earlier (2)
- Cut down the paper work (1)
- Coordinate efforts better with Project Success (1)
- Have Project Success do the home evaluations (1)
- Have fewer two year students (1)
- Provide social worker/chairperson with a copy of all updated listings (1)
- Require the parent to meet with the social worker as part of the student enrollment process (1)

15. How many "two or more year students" on the plan of improvement list still need a written student improvement plan?

| Number | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 1 | 15 | 88.2 |
| Not Applicable | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

... Of these students how many require further evaluations, such that a written student improvement plan can be formulated?

- One transfer student

16. On the basis of written student improvement plans to date, please give a ranking (1 = Most Often to 6 = Least Often) of the student needs most often included in these plans.

| Student Needs | Average Ranking |
|---|---|
| Academic | 2.0 |
| Social Behavior | 2.8 |
| Attendance | 3.5 |
| Emotional | 3.5 |
| Family | 4.2 |
| Health | 5.3 |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

17. If there are reoccurring actions (typical activities) for many students in a particular need area. Please list them by need area below.

| Need Areas | Actions To Be Taken |
|---|---|
| Academics: | — Tutoring after school (12)<br>— Tutoring before school (2)<br>-- Tutoring by high school student (1)<br>— Tutoring at lunch (1)<br>-- Parent/teacher conferences (3)<br>— EXTRA (2)<br>-- Weekly progress report (1)<br>— Reduce assignments and then gradually increase (2)<br>— Peer learning (cooperative learning) (2)<br>— Counseling (2)<br>-- Parent volunteers (1)<br>— READ (1)<br>-- Classroom strategies (1)<br>— Consult with teacher (1)<br>— Focus of student deficiencies on CAT test (1)<br>— Compensatory education services (1)<br>-- Assignment notebooks (1)<br>— TAP program (1)<br>-- Junior REAP (1) |
| Attendance: | — Home visits (4)<br>— Monitoring by home school aide (4)<br>— Progress reports/letters (4)<br>-- Every other day monitoring (3)<br>— Monitoring by Project Success outreach worker (3)<br>— Counseling (2)<br>— Social worker interventions (1)<br>— Resource officers (1)<br>-- Court referrals (1)<br>— A stipend to reward students and their families (1) |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## APPENDIX D

### 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

17. (Continued)

| Need Areas | Actions To Be Taken |
|---|---|
| Social Behavior: | — Social worker interventions (6)<br>— Counseling (5)<br>— Modeling (4)<br>— Parent conferences/contact (3)<br>— Monitoring/progress reports (2)<br>— Consultations with Project Success (2)<br>— Praise (2)<br>— Daily behavior checklists signed by every teacher (2)<br>— Self-development and self-esteem programs (1)<br>— Behavior management (1)<br>— Administration (1)<br>— Suspensions (1)<br>— Board hearings (1) |
| Emotional: | — Referrals to school social worker (8)<br>— Counseling (6)<br>— Referrals to outside agencies (3)<br>— Parent conferences (3)<br>— Consultations with Project Success (3)<br>— Medical referrals (2)<br>— Behavior management program developed in school with parent (1)<br>— Referral to school psychologist (1) |
| Family: | — Home visit by social worker (6)<br>— Home visit by Project Success outreach worker (5)<br>— Information/referrals to community programs (4)<br>— Parent conferences (4)<br>— Behavior management program developed in school with parent (2)<br>— Counseling (2)<br>— Social worker intervention (2)<br>— Behavior intervention checklist (1)<br>— Monitoring (1)<br>— Transportation (1) |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

17. (Continued)

Health:

-- Referrals to nursing services and/or physicians (5)
— Project Success outreach worker referrals to doctor and clinic to provide transportation (4)
— Social worker intervention (2)
-- Counseling (1)
— Speech and hearing teacher referrals (1)
— Medicine administration in building (1)
-- Documents from medical doctor (1)
— Prevention program (1)

18. To date, how many review meetings, if any, have been held?

| Number of Meetings | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 3 | 17.6 |
| 1 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 2 | 4 | 23.5 |
| 3 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 5 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 6 | 1 | 5.9 |
| 35 | 1 | 5.9 |
| Many at each meeting | 1 | 5.9 |
| Not Applicable | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

... If some have been held, how many "two or more year students" have been processed to date:

| Number | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 50.0 |
| 2 | 3 | 30.0 |
| 4 | 1 | 10.0 |
| 18 | 1 | 10.0 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 100.0 |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

19. Did you attend the inservice session concerning PST/Project Success held this fall?

| Response | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| No | 1 | 5.9 |
| Yes | 16 | 94.1 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

... If yes, what was your overall assessment of the effectiveness of the inservice to improve practices in the PST process? (Check one)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 2 | 11.8 |
| Good | 5 | 29.4 |
| Average | 5 | 29.4 |
| Fair | 3 | 17.6 |
| Poor | 1 | 5.9 |
| No Response | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

Comments

- Staff members not sensitive to the number of students needing processing and the limited time and people resources to accomplish the task (3)
- Material presented could have been put in a memo (1)
- Confusion over who could be referred (1)
- Told us things we already knew and had done (1)
- Very informative (1)
- Need more direction in completing paper work (1)

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

20. Overall, have the PST forms improved since last year?

| | # | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No | 8 | 47.1 | ... If no, what area(s) have the forms gotten worse or stayed the same? |

- All forms need to be in one packet like special education (2)
- Basically the same forms(2)
- Project Success not on form as referral option (1)
- Completion of section two regarding types of instruction the student has received (1)

| | # | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 8 | 47.1 | ... If yes, what area(s) have the forms gotten better? |

- More space to write in and less duplication (3)
- Parent notification/authorization form (2)
- More pertinent information (2)
- More comprehension (1)
- Less time consuming (1)
- Action plan form (1)
- Easier to complete (1)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| No Response | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.1* |

*Due to rounding.

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

21. Overall this school year, has the communication process concerning PST and Project Success improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse? (Check one)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Improved | 7 | 41.2 |
| Stayed the same | 6 | 35.3 |
| Gotten worse | 3 | 17.6 |
| Not Applicable | 1 | 5.9 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 |

Comments

- More team work between the social worker and outreach worker is needed (2)
- Qualified people spread too thin (1)
- Have not received written progress reports from Project Success (1)
- Fewer options for helping students with greater needs (1)
- Less contact in our elementary school (1)
- New staff, both of them are conscientious workers (1)

22. Which of the following Project Success activities/services have been implemented for the benefit of your students? (Check all that apply)

| Project Success Activities/Services | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| After school study center | 14 | 82.3 |
| Mentoring program | 6 | 35.3 |
| Adopt-a-school | 4 | 23.5 |
| Parent training/information | 2 | 11.8 |
| GAP | 1 | 5.9 |
| Before school tutoring (7:45 to 8:30 a.m.) | 1 | 5.9 |
| Use of high school honor students as tutors | 1 | 5.9 |
| Program for 10-12 grade students | 1 | 5.9 |

APPENDIX D

1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST)
PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

23. Considering the work done so far this school year by Project Success staff to provide linkages with other agencies, offer services, and give insight; how would you rate the overall effectiveness of the Project Success staff member(s) in doing this job? (Check one)

| | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 2 | 11.8 |
| Good | 4 | 23.5 |
| Average | 6 | 35.3 |
| Fair | 1 | 5.9 |
| Poor | 2 | 11.8 |
| No Response | 2 | 11.8 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 100.1* |

*Due to rounding.

Comments:

- Need more people on staff (3)
- They do a good job with the services they provide (1)
- They do not provide linkages with any other agencies (1)
- Visits and contacts seem to be instigating adjudication rather than remediation (1)

APPENDIX D

## 1992-93 CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PUPIL SERVICE TEAM (PST) PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CONT.)

24. What other changes, if any, could be made to improve the PST process?

- Allow more time to meet with concerned staff (4)
- Less paper work or more time to complete it (3)
- None (2)
- Diversify services of compensatory education teachers to do more than pull-out (2)
- Project Success workers should be able to work with more than two year students (1)
- Consistency in the listing of students to be served (1)
- Training for teachers about PST and what qualifies a kid for special education (1)
- Follow-up on strategies (1)
- A social worker should be hired for Project Success (1)
- Administration should be represented at each meeting (1)
- Develop a plan that focuses on a positive and nuturing environment to increase daily student attendance (1)